exactly in the same case; and thus they take away the whole strength of this objection against the Atheists. For if God could communicate such a plastic power, it follows, that it is not inconsistent with the nature of things, that there be such agents. They may therefore exist of themselves, -will the adversary say; whence it would also follow, that the regularity which we observe in the universe, may be the effect of a blind cause, which was not -conscious of what it did." Mr. Bayle> however, owned, that Dr. Cudworth and Dr. Grew were not aware of the consequence, which, according to him, followed from their system. Monsieur le Clerc returned an answer in the fifth volume of his Bibliotheque Choisie ;[a] wherein he observed, that the plastic or vital natures, which those two writers admit, cannot in the least favour the Atheists; because these natures are only instruments in the hand of God, and have no power or efficacy but what they receive from him, who rules and directs all their actions. That they are only instrumental causes produced and employed by the chief and First Cause; and that it cannot be said, that a palace has been built up without art, because not only hammers, rales, saws, &d but even the arms of men, which made use of these instruments, are destitute of knowledge. It is sufficient, that the mind of the builder directed all these things, and employed them in the exe* cution of his design. It is therefore plain, that the Atheists, who deny the being of an intelligent Cause, cannot retort the argument of Dr. Cud-and Dr. Grew upon them. Monsieur Bay le,